

61832/P

P 10T

(C)

Ministry. Answer of an unbaptized

Clergyman ... 1823.

K



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/b30376853>

7

ANSWER

TO

THE ADMONITION

OF A PERSON STYLING HIMSELF

A BENEFICED CLERGYMAN.

Rev Robt Taylor

ANSWER

OF

AN UNBENEFICED CLERGYMAN

OF THE DIOCESE OF DUBLIN,

TO THE

ADMONITION

Of a Person well known to him and others,

MOST FALSELY & WICKEDLY

STYLING HIMSELF

A BENEFICED CLERGYMAN

OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH;

WHEREIN

HIS SOPHISTICAL AND ABSURD SUPPORT

OF

THE RECENT MIRACLES

IS EXPOSED.



DUBLIN:

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY R. M. TIMS,

GRAFTON-STREET,

And by the principal Booksellers.

1823

0966

7

RECEIVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

1911

ADDITIONAL

LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

LIBRARY

LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

ANSWER, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

I do not give you the title your Publisher claims for you on *his word*. In spite of the titles he gives you, in spite of your *assumed* benefice, or the tail of capital letters depending on your name, I should still hold you to be some cloaked Jesuit, knowing, as I do, that it is not the first time that members of that confraternity have cassocked themselves as our clergy, and have come, in such seemly guise, to present the box of Pandora to our church. But, Sir, I know you; in this instance I renew my acquaintance with my heterodox friend; and it grieves me exceedingly to find, that the same unquiet and erring spirit still haunts your head and heart. I deplore that you should come forward, either in jest or seriousness, to lend your aid to the delusion that is now sent on the Irish Romanists—tempting them to believe a lie. I found you a sophist at first, I find you a sophist still. And this same man, who was ere while so absurd and so hardy, as to deny the truth of the articles he swore to, and yet still maintain himself to be a true and consistent member of the church of England, now ventures on the monstrous paradox of defending Popery as the Catholic church (its truth as attested by the Divine presence and Divine favour, working miracles in its cause) and yet still declaring he will live and die a Protestant. Had I not known you, Sir, to be tossed to and fro, carried about with every wind of doctrine, now a Pelagian—now an Arian—now denying the eternity of future punishment, would otherwise shudder in astonishment, at the new and horrible thing that is by you committed in this land. But I repeat it, I know you, and am not at all surprised at any absurdity of conduct, or any obliquity of mind, emanating from you.

You begin your Pastoral by stating, “that these glorious miracles, (as you are pleased to call them) the more they are contemplated the brighter will their effulgence appear. This thing, you say, was not done in a corner, it challenges investigation, it defies disproof.” This round assertion, which I know, by sad experience, you are too fond of, I meet with assertion too. And I maintain that it was done in a corner, that

it *has* shrunk from fair investigation, and *has* been disproved as miraculous. And if God has given cures to certain Romanists, he has given such cures according to the course of nature, not against it. You proceed to warn us in opposing these miracles, not to wound Christianity through the sides of the Catholic Church (as you are pleased to call Popery.) Who, Sir, are the Wounders? Not we, but such as you, such as Cobbett, such as Doctors Doyle and Murray, such as Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, who have all formed a confraternity to strike the greatest wound that ever was inflicted on the Scripture miracles, by attempting to put them on the same footing with Popish.

We, clergymen of the Established Church, do hold that there is as broad a line of distinction, as wide as that between a feigned Purgatory and a real Heaven; between Popish prodigies and Scripture miracles; marking out the one as human lies, and the other as divine incontrovertible truths.

You say, "that in the gospel miracles and the Hohenlohe prodigies there is the closest possible resemblance; in circumstances an almost absolute uniformity, in the alleged ends the same apparent counsel and design of the divine benignity." How can you say this? Dare you presume to say the wonders which bishops Murray and Doyle attest—the curing of two nervous women, of diseases that have just as suddenly, in exactly similar cases, given way to the workings of excited imagination; dare you, Sir, have the impiety to hold, that these have the closest resemblance to the mighty miracles of Jesus? the raising of the dead, the feeding of the multitude, the stilling of the storm!

The miracles of individual healing Jesus and his disciples performed to confer, confirm, or increase the faith of individuals. But the mighty deeds by which he attested his divine mission, in the open day, in the front and face of his enemies, were above, beyond, and so contrary to natural causes or effects, that no imagination, no operation of art or science, or deceit, could either imitate or invent the like.

You then proceed to say, that it is absurd and impious in a minister of the Church of England to impugn these manifestations of the divine power (as you are pleased to call them.) And why do you say that it is absurd? because, forsooth, we subscribe to the thirty-nine Articles, in one of which it is declared, that the Homilies contain good and wholesome doctrine. And who denies this? Sir, *we* do not, but I know of old *you* do deny that these Homilies contain good and wholesome doctrine. They are, indeed, most approved and excellent expositions of scripture truth, written by the bright and fresh, and vivid and day-springing lights of the Reformation. But still they were uninspired men. We subscribe to their general doctrines as most sound and saving. But that is no reason why we should believe every word they record. The Homilies are not our scripture. Yet

still because the Homilies are, in almost every part, conformable to scripture, we say they *contain* good and wholesome doctrine.

But, in this part of your letter, you make a fair exhibition of character; you shew yourself indeed a most contemptible sophist: and in the garbled extract you give, you evince that you wish not for truth, but only desire to increase delusion.

The Homily you make your extract from is the second part of that against "the peril of idolatry," in which the pious writer faithfully proves from the lives and actions of the early fathers of the church, that image worship was neither admitted nor tolerated; and as one instance, amongst others, he brings forward what Epiphanius did, how he tore a painted cloth which he found hanging at a church door, on which was painted an image of Christ; because, he rightly said, that such pictures were contrary to the scriptures: then he goes on to say, that Epiphanius wrote a letter to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, declaring what he had done: and then the writer of the homily brings in the evidence of St. Jerome to testify as to the genuineness of the letter of Epiphanius to John. Then, as St. Jerome has ever been held in the highest possible estimation by the church of Rome, the homily writer brings forward another testimony from St. Jerome, as to the character of Epiphanius, whom he calls Pope Epiphanius,* (for all notable bishops were at that time called Popes); wherein St. Jerome magnifies this Pope Epiphanius for learning and godliness, even above John, patriarch of Jerusalem. The homily writer also brings forward another evidence of a writer, in high character with the church of Rome, namely, the author of the Tripartite Ecclesiastical History, who says that Epiphanius was such a godly man, that being yet alive he did work miracles, and that when dead, devils were expelled at his tomb. These are the words, not of the homily writer, remember, but of the Romish writer of the Tripartite Ecclesiastical history.

Now to any man of unprejudiced honest mind, this passage in the homily would obviously appear to be what logicians call an "Argumentum ad hominem," shewing what we Protestants can advance against the practice of image worship as held by the church of Rome, the authority of Epiphanius; an authority which they must respect, because the sanctity, learning, and orthodoxy of Epiphanius is attested by two Romish writers of eminence, one of whom, namely, the author of the Tripartite History, so much respects the man, that he runs into the usual popish practice of making out stories of miracles that were wrought by him.

Now, reverend and subtle Sir, you have told us nothing of all this; (but with what candour and sincerity, I leave the Public to judge,) given us the words of the anonymous author of a

* Epiphanius was Bishop of Salamine, not of Rome.

Popish history, called the Tripartite Ecclesiastical History, as the opinion and testimony of the writer of the Homily, in favour of miracles said to be performed since Apostolic times! whereas the homily treats not of miracles at all! You might as well affirm that we, ministers of the church of England, are equally bound to believe, by the thirty-nine Articles, every word the author of the Tripartite History has written,

You next proceed to say we are in a worse dilemma, because we must either deny, that the scriptures are handed down by incorrupt tradition, or allow the continuance of miraculous powers in the church to the present time. And you say, that "the holy church, throughout all the world," must either have palmed on us the grossest lies (meaning the scriptures,) or that she does not lie now in asserting miraculous powers. But here, Sir, are two "non sequiturs," two fallacies. Do you presume to say, the church of Rome is the holy church throughout all the world? If you mean this (and what else can you mean?) I assert you are no Protestant, and let you be what you may, you are no true reasoner. I dare you to prove that the Pope's church is the holy church throughout all the world.

Again—you assert that, on the authority of the church of Rome, we believe the Holy Scriptures have been faithfully preserved to us. This also is false. Alas! if the word of God had alone flowed to us through such a foul channel, then, indeed, must its sweet and healing waters have become poisoned and adulterated in the transit. But no such thing, we have them not exclusively through the church of Rome—we have taken them from the Greek church, the Coptic church; the Syriac church, the Armenian church, &c. &c. &c. Protestants, as such, have proved, and shall prove that the true Catholic Church of Christ owes its authority to Holy Scripture, and not the Holy Scriptures to it.

We believe not what is recorded in the word of God, either as to doctrine or facts, because the Romish church or writers bear testimony to the scriptures; not because they preserved its manuscripts, which they could not in every case interpolate or destroy—but because the holy church throughout all the world, every Christian people, churches that Rome could neither conquer nor pervert, have handed us down the word of God, thus providentially preserved from Rome's imposture or interpolation.

No, Sir, the word of God depends not on the testification of any particular church on earth; and it is worthy of all acceptance, not by virtue of the testimony which the church of Rome has borne to it, but because admirably adapted to the wants and necessities of fallen man; it bears, besides ten thousand tests of external evidence, an internal evidence also, that it is the love letter of the everlasting Father of mercies to his prodigal children, calling us back to his bosom through our Lord and

Saviour Jesus Christ, Yes, it is because it holds forth the only solid ground of hope to the perishing creature: testifying of Jesus, that the Bible is to us the Anchor of our souls, sure and stedfast.

And we take the testimony of the church of Rome to the holy scripture, as, amongst many other witnesses, one is produced in court who comes forward unwillingly, to attest a deed which militates against himself.

Now, Sir, the validity of that testimony we cannot allow, as any way bearing on the subject of the claims of that church to miraculous gifts and power. You ask is the Lord's ear deaf that it cannot hear? No it is not deaf, but it will not hear Prince, Bishop, or Priest, when they cry, O Baalim hear us.—And his arm is not shortened, but it will not be stretched forth to perform any equivocal in-consequential semi-miracle,* nor yet to prove any unscriptural unspiritual doctrine. You say “that most impious are the deniers of these miracles, because such denials tend to disprove the efficacy of prayer: for that no one truth can more consequentially depend on another than that if God hears and answers prayer, then certain effects must take place which would not otherwise have happened.” But, Sir, the promises made to *faithful* prayers included no engagement that miracles should be perpetual. The miraculous faith that could remove mountains ceased with the Apostolic times. Yet whenever two or three are gathered together, God often still answers the fervent suppliant, by pouring out on his soul love and peace, and joy, by “cleansing the thoughts of our hearts through the inspiration of his Holy Spirit.” He gives us strength to withstand the wiles of Satan, and thus enables us to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. God may moreover hear our prayer asking for temporal sufficiency, he may and does give us “day by day our daily bread;” nay more, he may strengthen our constitution so as to enable us to recover bodily health. But I hold that no christian now is sanctioned in demanding or expecting from God extraordinary interpositions of his omnipotence.

* In the learned and Reverend Mr. Faber's remarks on the late miracles, he shows that the prayers made to St. John Nepomucene, are a proof that the old Daimonolatriy, or worship of canonized mortals, called demons, or Baalim, is now practised, as was foretold by the apostle Paul in 1 Tim. 4. ch. 5. v. where he says: “Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in later times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons.” And Epiphanius, rightly understanding that canonized mortals are similar to the Dæmons, or Baalim of Paganism, remarks that the drift of the apostle's prediction was, “that hereafter there shall be worshippers of the dead amongst professed believers in the gospel, even as dead men, or Baalim were formerly worshipped by the ancient Israelites. Epiphanius adv. Hær. 78. sect. 22. So that praying to St. John Nepomuscene; is similar to crying, O Baal, hear us!

Bodily and visible miracles have ceased, they are no more wanting to true christians or a true church. Why should true christians want bodily and material miracles? To those who have substantiated or realised the things hoped for, to those who have the clearer evidence of things unseen, what is the body or what is any thing that this material world owns, that it should be worth a miracle for its maintenance. No, Sir, all the true Christian asks is the spiritually miraculous gift of a changed heart, in rising from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. He seeks not earthly but spiritual things—the power of God, the producing a new creature in Christ Jesus; the conversion of those who sit in darkness, and the shadow of death into the marvellous light of Gospel regeneration. These are the great things that the probationer for eternity looks for on earth, and he leaves it to a carnal and worldly church “which has its God (as Father Paul says) here on earth, to live by sense and not by faith, and look to the things of matter and not mind; valuing no miracles but such as are bodily and material.” On the same principle Romanists now carnalize the Eucharist of the Lord Jesus, and bring him from heaven to dwell in an idol which a miller has ground, and a baker has made. Just so they must now have sensible miracles to turn the spirituality of the service of the Lord Jesus into a sensual, visible and idolatrous worship.

But you proceed to submit, you say, in Godly humility and sincerity, the following pregnant questions to those who do not doubt the miracles on which christianity is founded.

First.—“If it be to be believed that God wrought miracles, at first, for the establishing of christian faith, when did they cease, or why should they ever cease till the Christian faith became universal—which it is not?”

To this I answer, they ceased when the Apostolic times had ceased—they ceased when the Canon of Scripture was completed, and received by the christian church—they ceased when Christianity became triumphant over paganism, by Constantine embracing it and establishing it as the faith of the civilized world—they ceased until the second coming of the Lord Jesus. In the mean time Holy Scripture is sufficient to testify of Jesus, and able to make all nations, and tongues, and people, wise unto salvation—and its sound now going forth unto all lands, and its truth unto the end of the earth; faithfully preached by single-hearted men, the Holy Spirit working with them; men holding the great record of life open, and pointing to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. Such men, without one miracle, or one prodigy, have made more genuine Christians in the little island of Otaheite—an island but thirty years since inhabited by cannibals, than have been, at any one time, found in all the parts of Ireland together, subjected to Popery, with all its holy wells, and tombs, and saints, and priests, for fourteen

hundred years. Therefore I maintain, that if the nations of the world will not now believe Moses and the prophets, speaking of a fallen creature and a broken law—if they will not believe Paul and Peter, and John and James, pronouncing the glad tidings, that there is now no more condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, “neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.”

But pray, Sir, if miraculous power is gifted to the church of Rome, why does she now only exert it in Nunneries, in Chapels, in the bed-chambers of popish ladies, not one present who is not interested in the carrying on of the miracles? Why does not this church go work her wonders amongst the Chinese, the Japanese, the Mahometans, the Hindoos? Let Hohenlohe convert one Bramin from the pride of his cast by curing a Hindoo blind from his birth, or let him wither the foot of a Japanese as he tramples on the ensign of his salvation; and when the Japanese cries out, Lord Jesus I believe, let him then restore his foot again. Let such deeds be done by Hohenlohe, in the sight of disinterested witnesses, worthy of credit, and then we may begin to think there is something in the matter.

Secondly.—You ask “why should not the extension of the christian faith, or its rise after a period of declension be held a worthy occasion of miraculous interposition?” To this I say, you must first prove that it is the *true* christian faith that has declined, before we can allow that its removal is worthy of miraculous interposition. And besides we know from the best authority that in the latter days a false Anti-christian faith will attempt to extend and renew itself by “coming after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.” 2 Thess. 2 ch. 9. v.

In the word of God there is not one promise to the Church of Christ, that it shall be promoted in latter days by miraculous aid. But there are many warnings that Anti-christ will be permitted to use prodigies as the deceiveableness of his unrighteousness. See Deut. xiii. 2 Thess. ii. 24. Mark 24. v. 13th and 16th chap. of Rev.

Thirdly.—You ask “Have the opposers of the late miracles been able to adduce such objections against them, as must not, by a parity of application, equally invalidate the credibility of some or all of the miracles of the old and new testament?”

I answer we have, and the onus lies on you, whether you be Deist, or Romanist, Turk, Jew or SOCINIAN, to prove that we have not.

Fourthly.—You ask “will the late miracles wrought in our days, as it were in our sight, and with respect to their grandeur or worthiness, or their end, shrink in comparison with the miraculous cures recorded in the bible, as for instance, Jonah in the whale’s belly, the fig tree which Christ cursed, &c. &c. &c.”

In answer.—This question smells strongly of a disbeliever in

all miracles. I think I see before me the Sardonic sneer of a despiser of all sacred revelation——GRANDEUR and WORTHINESS!!! has Prince Hohenlohe performed any miracle on the animal or vegetable creation? Say, boldly, yes or no. Has he cured one blind from his birth? when you or any one else can show that he has performed such deeds, then we will allow their grandeur, and not till then.

As to the End of Hohenlohe's prodigies, that comes within the scope of the next question For,

Fifthly.—You say “it is not to Prince Hohenlohe, but to God you ascribe these glorious miracles; not by the name or virtue of a mortal like ourselves, but by virtue of the name of Jesus, have these wonderful works been done.”

Sir, in this question you give the lie to Hohenlohe Doctors Murray and Doyle. For they say, that these prodigies were done for the sake of prayer made “to the Lord Jesus, in conjunction with St. John Nepomuscene.” And we find in the shop of your party's printer and bookseller, a Hohenlohe prayer-book, wherein, in order to obtain the miraculous gifts that all Romanists are now looking after, a Pater Noster, and an Ave Maria, (that is our Father which art in heaven, and hail Mary full of grace,) are to be said to St. John Nepomuscene!!!

Moreover, the end of these miracles is *not* the same; for St. Augustine tells us*, that the miracles of the apostolic times attested nothing else but the great and joyful news to sinners, that Christ had come in the flesh to die for our sins, and rise for our justification. But if we believe Doctor Murray, who is a better authority, and is better benefited than you, these modern miracles attest the sacrifice of the Mass, and are sent to prove that the Lord Christ is degraded, and transmuted, body soul and divinity into a bit of bread, made by the baker of his chapel, or friary.

Sixthly.—You demand—“Is it any disparagement to these miraculous cures, any more than to those of Christ and his apostles, that the persons on whom they are performed, continued notwithstanding subject to the common lot of humanity, and liable to relapse.”

Where, Sir, did you read of any patient miraculously cured by the Lord or his apostles, relapsing into the complaints with which they were formerly afflicted, or continuing in some degree subject to them. Scripture says “they were made whole.” The cripple did not want help after he had acquired “perfect soundness,” but went his way, leaping and rejoicing, and praising God. He did not keep his bed, like the woman whom the Jesuits report to have been lately miraculously cured at Clane.* He did not totter into the room, so

* August. Civ. Dei. Lib. 22. ch. 9.

* See “Exposure of Miracles, in the Co. Kildare,” lately published by a valuable clergyman.

wan, so weak, as to be altogether unable to take a turn in the garden, like Nun Stewart. No, Sir, his pulse did not run fever high, but he was made strong:

In the same way, the man blind from his birth, when cured by our Saviour, did not want a wife to lead him about by the hand, like the beggar, lately said to be cured at Mass at Celbridge.

But enough.—This question about relapses, is a Jesuitical way of preparing the docile minds of deluded Romanists to receive future accounts of the relapses of Mrs. Stewart, or Miss Lalor, or Miss Dowel.

Seventhly.—You say that “the power of working miracles by the apostles, was not entirely at their own volition, and that God’s power, in this way, is not to be dictated to by human presumption.”—So far I agree with you; but you go on to say, that “faith in the patient was, in every case, necessary to his cure”—Indeed!!! Why, Sir, I fear you deal too much in dashing dangerous assumption, even to be admitted a lay brother in the crafty society of Ignatius. What, and do you bring, as an example to your purpose, the case of the cripple cured at the temple gate by Peter and John! For, according to you, as he was desired to fasten his eyes on the apostles, while they looked on him, this, you infer, proves faith on the part of the cripple. Now let us look at the text which says, Acts, ch. iii. ver. 3. “The lame man, seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple, asked alms. And Peter fastenining his eyes on him, with John, said, look on us, and he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive *something*. Then Peter said, silver and gold I have none, but such as I have give I thee: in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk.” Now, Sir, you say that his looking on the apostles implied that the cripple had faith. Is this the case, does not the text refute your position, clearly implying he had no faith, for “he gave heed to the apostles, and looked on them.” (Why?) “because he expected to receive something from them,”—that is alms!

Had the Centurion’s servant faith, whose cure St. Luke mentions in his 7th chapter?

Had Malchus faith, whose ear was cut off and restored? Answer me here, Sir, or have I sufficiently disproved your assertion, that “the faith of the patient was in every case necessary to his cure, and was always the measure and limit of it.”

No, Sir, the faith of the patient was not in every instance required.—In order that this one great circumstance might, in after ages, serve as a limit and boundary line to mark off the apostolic miracles, from being compared and mingled with lying wonders, which might by Antichrist be performed, by working on the nervous excitability, and high wrought imagination, of deluded patients, submitted to enthusiastic quackery.

Eighthly.—You ask, “does not the ridicule, which is now

thrown on these modern prodigies, impinge with the same force on the apostolic miracles we profess to reverence?" The only answer I desire to give to this, is, that there can be no comparison between things totally dissimilar. I may scorn *you* as a sophist, and my scorn may not impinge on Mr. Locke. I may think his Grace, the Archbishop of Dublin, an active overseer of his diocese, and not think you fit to be permitted to preach in that diocese. I may brand a forged note with red ink, and at the same time I may set the proper value on a Bank of Ireland note, and wish I had more of them.

Lastly.—You ask, "have the opposers of the recent miracles attempted distinctly to show, on what ground it is, that in the teeth of Christ's serious assertion, that he would be with his church to the end of the world; and that greater works than his, should his disciples do? yet we say we will believe only the miraculous works done by Christ and his apostles."

To this I finally answer that they were not *miraculous* works only our Saviour meant here, but the great work of the conversion of the Gentiles, by preaching the everlasting gospel; for which purpose he promised that he would send his holy spirit to work with them. This happened when, after the Pentecost effusion of the Holy Spirit, he sent his apostles to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

And as to our Saviour remaining with the church unto the end of the world, he does so, protecting, upholding her, in order that the gates of hell should not prevail against her; but it was never meant he should be with her in any visible or miraculous manifestation: for the true members of his church live by faith and not by sense: and the words that Jesus now speaks to his own, "they are Spirit, and they are Life."

Sir, if I undertook to be with you and befriend you in the course of your journey through life, if I said you should have always my advice and assistance, to keep you from harm's way, to warn you when in the wanderings of your spirit you were likely to fall into the pit of infidelity, or into the traps of Jesuits, there is no reason why I should bestow on you my property, or that you should be gifted with my peculiar endowments.

In addition to all this, it is palpable our Lord made promises to his apostles, which *he meant not for those who should come after them*.—If the popish priests can now, as they audaciously assume, forgive sins, cast out devils, transubstantiate the wafer, work these *dubious* miracles; why do they not enjoy the other apostolic gifts, by which their flocks might be convinced? Why can none of them "speak tongues" they never learned, "raise the dead," or "remove mountains," according to their Saviour's promise?

And now, Sir, I have come to the conclusion of your letter. I submit your letter and my answer to the Public for it to judge

which has truth and reason on his side. Were you merely a Phantom Parson set up by your popish publishers, I should not waste my shot by firing at a scare crow. But I believe you to be in the orders of the Established Church, at the same time that I know you have neither benefice, nor care of souls. You and I methinks are old acquaintances and perhaps you may have reason to say "hast thou found me, O mine enemy." I said before I ascertained this fact I would throw my considering cap into the fire, and never guess again, if I had not found you out.—Oh, thou most absurd of men, to say in the face of the world, that you protest against a church which you allow and extol as Catholic, and whose truth and stability you pronounce to be "attested by the finger of God."

Heretics I have heard and read of, as being called so by *others*, but never before did I hear of or see a man, who acknowledged himself to be a heretic, a wanderer from a church he considered true, and yet pronounced that he would live and die a protester against her truth. Oh! excess of liberality to fight thy battles for a church that conscientiously sends thee to hell.

Cobbett and you, "*Duo fulmina belli*"—two weathercocks of wind, are worthy of the course you have taken in hand. The cause is worthy of you, and you of their cause.

But alas! how are the mighty fallen? How is that church, which produced that Goliath of Gath, Bellarmine, and all the other sons of the giant? How has she fallen, when "*tui auxilio et defensoribus istis tempus eget?*"

I repeat it sir, I know you; I can not so soon forget your hard words, your Babylonish dialect; your quotation to me not long ago, of the very identical passage in the Homilies, with which you now favour the public.

Other traces of the same erring step and spirit, I think I can discern, "*ex Pede Herculem.*" I may however be mistaken; and if so, humbly implore pardon, not of the Beneficed Clergyman, but of———. But until the popish publisher brings forth your name, or until you yourself cast off the assassin cloak, to declare manful war against that church in which you have taken orders, (at which time you swore to maintain her articles when she pronounces, that the church of Rome is neither true nor catholic,) until that time I must consider you as not beneficed any where, except in "*partibus infidelium,*" and that you partake of the faithlessness of your parishioners, or in the moon, where your lunatic flock may endow you with a tythe of their wrongheadedness.

The author of the above-mentioned answer, has no desire to conceal his name; and hereby he declares his full intention of publishing it, when the Beneficed Clergyman, this F. R. S. and A. M. (which I take to mean, Fellow of the Renegade Society, and Master of Absurdity,) publishes his—or when, as I guess, it will soon be published for him.

